```
1
    D. GILL SPERLEIN, SBN 172887
    THE LAW OFFICE OF D. GILL SPERLEIN
    345 Grove Street
    San Francisco, CA 94114
3
    Telephone: (415) 404-6615
    Facsimile: (415) 404-6616
4
    gill@sperleinlaw.com
5
    LAWRENCE G. WALTERS, FL SBN 776599 (pro hac vice)
6
    WALTERS LAW GROUP
    195 West Pine Ave.
7
    Longwood, FL 32750
8
    Telephone: (407) 975-9105
    larry@firstamendment.com
9
    Attorneys for Plaintiffs
10
    OXANE "GYPSY" TAUB and GEORGE DAVIS
11
                            UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12
                         NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
                                SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
13
     OXANE "GYPSY" TAUB and GEORGE )
                                             Case № 3:12-cv-05841-EMC (NJV)
14
     DAVIS.
15
                 Plaintiffs,
           v.
16
     CITY and COUNTY of SAN
17
     FRANCISCO and the SAN
     FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
18
                 Defendants
19
     and
                                             Case № 3:15-cv-04336
20
     GEORGE DAVIS AND OXANE
                                             EMERGENCY NOTICE OF RELATED
21
     "GYPSY" TAUB,
                                             CASE, ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION
                                             TO IMMEDIATELY RELATE CASES,
22
                                             AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
                 Plaintiffs,
23
           v.
                                             DATE: 9/24/15 (hearing on TRO)
24
     CITY and COUNTY of SAN
                                             TIME: 1:30
                                             COURTROOM: 5, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor
     FRANCISCO and the SAN
25
     FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
                 Defendants
26
27
                                           -1-
28
                                                NOTICE OF RELATED CASE AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
```

195 West Pine Avenue, Longwood, FL 32750 407-975-9150

THE LAW OFFICE OF D. GILL SPERLEIN 345GROVE STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 415-404-6615

WALTERS LAW GROUP

Pursuant to Local Rules 3-12 and 7-11, Plaintiffs hereby request that the newly filed case of *GEORGE DAVIS and OXANE "GYPSY" TAUB v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT*, be ordered related to the earlier filed case of *OXANE "GYPSY" TAUB and GEORGE DAVIS v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT*, Case № 3:12-cv-05841-EMC (NJV). Plaintiffs request that the cases be related immediately and on an emergency basis in order that the court may schedule to hear oral argument on Plaintiffs' motion for a temporary restraining order on the Court's civil law and motion calendar, September 24<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 p.m.

## **ARGUMENT**

## A. The Cases Should Be Related.

Pursuant to local rule 3-12, the Court will order cases related when, "(1) The actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and (2) It appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges."

Here the parties are identical. Plaintiffs are George Davis and Oxane "Gypsy" Taub and the Defendants are the City and County of San Francisco and the San Francisco Police Department. Moreover the claims are similar in that they both involve the Defendants' denial of Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights and the matters are likely to involve significantly overlapping discovery. Therefore the first element necessary to relate the cases is present.

Moreover, there is a high likelihood that having the cases heard before different judges will cause an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results. Plaintiffs' claims in the earlier filed case are currently on appeal, but maybe remanded to this Court. Those claims include an allegation that the Defendants' systematically deny Plaintiffs' First Amendment

protected right to engage in nude protest. In the more recently filed case, Plaintiffs again allege denial of First Amendment rights. However, these claims are based on the denial of a parade permit. While the question of a First Amendment right to engage in nude expressive behavior is in question, there is no doubt that participating in a parade is quintessential First Amendment activity. Although the cases target two different types of expressive behavior, since the Parties are the same and much of the evidence to support the claims will overlap and hearing the cases before different judges would undoubtedly cause overly burdensome and unnecessary expense and judicial resources.

Therefore, the cases should be related.

## B. The Cases Should Be Related Immediately So that the Court Can Schedule Oral Argument on Plaintiffs Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order.

This more recently filed case involves the Defendants' unconstitutional refusal to issue a permit for a parade to be held on Saturday, September 26, 2015. Plaintiffs are drafting and will file a Motion for Temporary Restraining Order by 10 a.m. on September 23<sup>rd</sup> (tomorrow). The motion will rely heavily on the Ninth Circuit decision in *Seattle Affiliate of the October 22nd Coalition To Stop Police Brutality, Repression and the Criminalization of a Generation v. City of Seattle*, 550 F.3d 788, (9th Cir. Wash. 2008). Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court relate the cases immediately so that when Plaintiffs file their emergency motion for temporary restraining order tomorrow, it can be scheduled for oral argument during the Court's regularly scheduled civil law and motion calendar on Thursday, September 24, 2015 at 1:30 p.m., or in any case, before the end of the Court day on Friday September 25, 2015.

Dated: September 22, 2015 Respectfully submitted,

/s/ D. Gill Sperlein

-3-

D. GILL SPERLEIN
THE LAW OFFICE OF D. GILL SPERLEIN

-4-